

THE NEW YORK TIMES, SUNDAY, JANUARY 16, 1983

War Against Subs: The West Hones Its Skills

By DREW MIDDLETON

There is a growing conviction in the navies of the United States and other Atlantic alliance countries that efforts to improve their antisubmarine warfare abilities may be the most significant of naval development programs.

Analysis In making such a point, naval analysts cite what they describe as a Soviet submarine threat. They say they believe that the Soviet submarine service is qualitatively the best part of the Soviet Navy and nearly the largest.

Intelligence sources estimate that

Moscow has 260 cruise-missile and attack submarines in commission, about 100 of them nuclear powered. By comparison, they say, the number of Soviet major surface combat ships is 294.

Faced with such developments, the

United States Navy devotes a large part

of its budget for research, development,

testing and evaluation to antisubmarine warfare projects. The magazine *Sea*

Technology says the Navy has allocated

\$1.182 billion, or roughly 20 percent of

the 1984 research budget, to antisub-

marine warfare.

Awareness of the Soviet submarine

threat has also stimulated antisubma-

rines. Thus, they say, only a few Soviet

submarines would be able in wartime to

penetrate the sea lanes between Green-

land and Iceland, and Iceland and Brit-

ain, and operate in the North Atlantic.

Some authorities, notably John F.

Lehman Jr., Secretary of the Navy, say

they believe that NATO's naval role in

that area should be more than a defen-

sive one. Mr. Lehman has been quoted re-

cently as saying that the alternative

should be a naval offensive into the

Norwegian Sea north of Iceland that

would put the Russians on the defen-

sive.

Most authorities, however, point out

that any projection of American and

NATO naval power into the Norwegian

Sea would be a high-risk operation.

They say carriers and their escorts and

submarines would be open to attack by

ships and aircraft of the Soviet forces based on the Kola Peninsula.

These sources say that antisubma-

rine warfare abilities, particularly in

the United States, have advanced to the

point that Soviet submarines at the

start of any East-West conventional

war could be placed on the defensive

and kept there.

Airborne antisubmarine warfare cur-

rently depends on two fixed-wing air-

craft, the Lockheed P-3C Orion and the

the carrier-borne Lockheed S-3A Viking.

The most modern of the antisubma-

rine warfare helicopter detectors is the

Sikorsky Seahawk, which will be car-

ried on frigates, destroyers and cruis-

ers.

Detection of submarines by surface

ships has been a problem because of the

noise generated by the ships' engines. For 20 years the Navy has been experimen-

ting with what are called towed ar-

rays — long cables fitted with hydro-

phones that are towed behind the parent

ship. Thus they are free of the noise of

the ship's propellers.

The Navy's attack submarines, re-

garded generally today as the most ef-

fective weapon against hostile undersea

craft, are fitted with special sonar

equipment.

A continuing problem for antisubma-

rine warfare operations is communica-

tions. Only extremely low frequency

radio waves can reach a submarine at

depth.

DO NOT FORGET THE NEEDIEST

SPECTACULAR! FAMOUS-DESIGNER SPORTSWEAR SALE.

NORMA KAMALI
NOW 58.00
Top, originally 78.00
NOW 54.00



OLEG CASS
NOW

PAGE 8A ★★



BRIEFLY / District

Host panel chairwoman named

Pamela Harriman, wife of former New York Gov. W. Averell Harriman, yesterday was named chairwoman of the regional Host Committee seeking to win the 1984 Democratic convention for Washington.

Harriman will head the effort by D.C., Maryland and Virginia officials to prepare for the April 7-9 site selection visit by the Democrats. Area officials said if the convention is held in D.C., the local economy would be \$30 million richer.

The DNC Site Selection and Technical Committee has visited San Francisco, New York and Detroit. It will visit D.C. and Chicago before announcing a selection on April 21.

Pathway to recourse closed

The Supreme Court has ruled that once an attorney is refused admission to the bar by the D.C. Court of Appeals, that attorney has no recourse to higher federal courts.

The nine justices, however, said, lower federal courts may scrutinize the rules of admission on which those D.C. Appeals decisions are based.

Under a 1970 court reform law, the D.C. Court of Appeals issues rules on admission to the bar and oversees a committee which decides whether applicants meet those rules. Attorneys may not practice law in the District unless they have been admitted to the bar.

BRIEFLY / Maryland

First settlers' arrival observed

Maryland state offices will be closed today in Montgomery and Prince George's counties in celebration of the first arrival of English settlers in the state in 1643.

The courts and state's attorneys' offices in both counties also will be closed. All other county offices in Montgomery and Prince George's counties will be open. Branch offices of Maryland's Internal Revenue Service will be open.

PG retains locator firm

Prince George's County has hired a national firm to find administrators for several of its departments.

Korn/Ferry International has become involved in the search for more than a month to help the county's Licenses and Permits, Services and Public Works departments.

The nationwide search is being conducted by a

best possible administrator.

County re-Approved For Release 2008/01/04 : CIA-RDP88B00443R000803370001-3

D.C. plans to finish 'highway to nowhere'

By Mary E. Chollet
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

The District's "highway to nowhere" at last will be going somewhere.

Harry Moy, of the District's Department of Transportation, said yesterday that final design plans for the unfinished 1,200 feet of Interstate 395's "Center Leg" are now being reviewed by DOT construction, design and parking staffs. The plans are expected to pass inspection with minimal changes.

"We're definitely going to finish it this time," Moy said.

The last seven blocks of I-395 have languished in limbo for the past decade. The 1½-mile section begins at Virginia Avenue SW. Plans to complete the leg through to New York Avenue NW near 4th Street were dropped, however, as the popularity of mass transportation eclipsed many highway proposals during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Plans for a north leg, that would have brought the project four miles farther to connect with the Capital Beltway, were abandoned in 1977.

The District has been operating the incomplete center leg as a municipal parking lot for the past five years. The 120 spaces have netted about \$250,000.

There are no plans to replace those parking spaces when the highway is finished, Moy said.

The project will cost "much more than the original \$10 million," Moy said, but he would not give a specific figure.

The District will fir



Third Street

of the pro
the rest.

The de
by about
project s:

Approv
April 8. A

by the en
advertis
struction
summer

New

th

the

THE WASHINGTON POST, FRIDAY,

Stephen S. Rosenfeld

Move Over, Henry

No policy game in this town is harder to break into than nuclear strategy. The heavy hitters have been at it for decades, and new boys, if they are not intimidated, are customarily waved off. All the more reason, then, to take note of Rep. Albert Gore Jr., a 34-year-old fourth-term Tennessee Democrat, the latest and in a way the unluckiest member of the club.

Exactly a year ago this week, Gore made his debut as a strategist—quietly, in the back pages of the Congressional Record. Nice, earnest, boyish-looking, former divinity and law student, ex-journalist Albert Gore. There were few ripples.

But wait. A year passes and Henry Kissinger, an original heavy hitter, comes out in Time with his “new approach” to arms control. No one can convince me, as a lot of people are now saying, that Kissinger stole it from Gore. Kissinger need coaching? Still, it is eerie how his analysis mirrors Gore’s: from the key concept to the key numbers.

Gore lacks the master’s experience and mystique, but that’s not everything. Kissinger, for instance, as much as anyone gave us what is increasingly widely seen (even, now, by him) as the colossal error of MIRV—putting many warheads on one launcher. MIRV made the nuclear soup we and the Russians are in now. We began it, they leapfrogged us, and we’re in the process of trying to leapfrog them. Kissinger manfully concedes his new package is designed to undo the damage done by

his old one. The Gores do not have to apologize for being new at the game.

They do, however, have to know something. Gore had been pondering the subject a bit when, at a Girls’ State meeting back home, he thought to ask if the girls expected a war in their time. Eighty-five percent of the hands went up. Could a war be prevented? Three or four hands. Gore, a strait-laced and ambitious man who happened then to be reviewing his purpose in politics, paused.

Early in 1981 he joined the Intelligence Committee, committing himself to spend at least four to six hours a week boning up. During this immersion he came upon “my conceptual breakthrough,” bouncing it off experts and polishing it for a year until he felt ready to go public.

Last year, well, I meant to sit down with Gore but didn’t get to it. This week I paid a call, alert for signs of the fanatic or the flake. There were none. Gore has gone beyond the catechism and is at ease with the flow of the debate. He has discipline, a readiness to listen and a hunger to persuade.

His “breakthrough”: for a dozen years the driving factor has been one side’s fear that the other has attained or will attain a capability to use its accurate multiple-warhead missiles to knock out the other’s land-based missiles in a first strike. Whether such a strike makes military sense is arguable, but the very possibility casts a long political and psychological shadow. The fear of a first

strike is the definition of strategic instability; it is what makes nukes dangerous.

Reagan’s approach, reducing the numbers of weapons but improving their striking power, would actually increase instability by leaving each side with greater ratio of warheads to land-based missile targets—with a greater fear of the other’s first strike.

To brutally foreshorten it: Gore’s answer is to move from multiple-warhead missiles back to single-warhead missiles. Each side would have an invulnerable deterrent but neither would have a first-strike capability—stability at last.

The single-warhead missile is the hot idea of the ‘80s. Gore and Kissinger are for it. The Scowcroft commission, trying to salvage a strategy from the MX wreckage, likes it. Some hawks are for it, some doves. The Soviets have nibbled: it offers them the same stability it offers us. At this point, it is still different things to different people. I will not try to sort it all out today.

My point lies elsewhere: starting from scratch, in a brief time, through personal exertion, Gore can fairly claim to have had a major role in, as he puts it, moving a central set of ideas from the perimeter of debate to the center. At a time of disarray inside the administration and dismay outside, he speaks clearly for stability, at once the prime nuclear value and the best available ground on which domestic consensus and international agreement might yet be built. Move over, Henry.

R
A
I
T
N

In
sivity
salva
the V
that i
aign
adviser
randa f
congres
they car
lead th
bargain
would s
Now
best—c
television
and defe

That i
tured rok
top White
the nuclea
cold-warri
—James E
Meese—kill
dent too clo
the nuclear t
Clark cor

Can't Wait

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

Star Wars Reality

"Let me share with you a vision of the future that offers hope," said President Reagan in his Wednesday night defense policy address to the nation, a clear recognition that in a world threatened with nuclear devastation, hope is a pressing need. The president's proposal, a response to the rising public clamor for nuclear "sanity," was that the United States use its advanced technological skills to set up defenses against nuclear attack.

It was an appropriate response, an assertion that even in a nuclear age, we can control our own destiny if we have the will and courage to do so. We do not solve such problems by painting our faces white and giving free play to our own fears in public demonstrations, but by using our wits to protect ourselves. The old concept of mutual assured destruction (MAD), which has proved so troubling to rational and humane people despite the fact that the U.S. has never deliberately targeted Soviet population centers, will be gradually supplanted with a policy that does not hold us hostage to a balance of terror, or at least so it is hoped.

Of course, this will revive the debate that led to the signing of the anti-ballistic missile treaty with the Soviet Union in 1972. The argument then was that missile defense was "destabilizing," giving one side the possibility of hiding behind a defensive shield while it obliterated the other. If that was ever true, it is not true today in this age of awesome offensive might, and it will be many years before it could become true. Nonetheless, Sen. Kennedy was quick off the mark yesterday criticizing the president's speech. He was joined by Moscow's Tass, charging that the president intended to violate the ABM treaty.

In an era where the Soviets are clearly violating arms agreements, the biological weapons convention for example, this gets to be a bit ridiculous. There is even a possibility that the Soviets themselves are in violation of the ABM treaty, or nearly so, with a missile, the SA-12, soon to be in production that may have the capability of intercepting ICBMs. The Soviets claim that it is designed only to counter tactical missiles.

But that aside, research on ABMs, which both sides have been conducting for years, does not violate the treaty, and that is all the president is proposing for the immediate future, albeit with a higher priority than in the past. However, that misses the point, too.

If the United States found itself able to develop a reliable anti-ballistic missile system it would want to deploy it. That possibility is some time

away, as the president indicated in his speech. But when it comes, the ABM treaty will have to be reconsidered. That is long overdue. It was a dubious agreement to begin with, clearly intended by the Soviets to neutralize America's technical superiority while they plunged ahead with their massive arms buildup.

It may well be, of course, that the president has been oversold on the technological possibilities today. Space stations with laser beams to zap incoming missiles are not just around the corner. But the president's aim was not to pull a defense system from a hat, but to set a new doctrinal course, one that would give the U.S. greater flexibility in responding to the Soviet threat. There are some offensive possibilities, touched on only vaguely in the speech, that also hold promise as a deterrent to Soviet adventures. Highly accurate conventional weapons to counter a nuclear-backed Soviet attack certainly deserve high priority as well.

And of course the president's offer of hope was part of a plea to the public to support his efforts to rebuild the nation's military capabilities in the face of opposition in the Democrat-controlled House. Judgments about how much military spending is enough differ widely, of course, and some of the congressmen challenging the Pentagon budget are no doubt honest in their belief that a smaller spending level would meet the nation's needs. But some, we fear, hold to the view that the Soviets will behave themselves if we simply talk to them sweetly enough. Hope is fine. Blind faith is very dangerous.

We ourselves have had some questions about whether the priorities of U.S. defense spending are correct. But we are aware that part of the problem in establishing rational priorities lies in the arms agreements past administrations have signed. Americans have assumed that they were intended to limit arms. The Russians have negotiated agreements that they knew to have enough loopholes to enable them to meet the arms buildup goals they had set for themselves. The results, in terms of Soviet superiority in numbers, were graphically outlined by the president.

We think the U.S. should arm itself in a way that makes the best use of advanced technology and recognizes urgent needs. The underlying message in the president's talk was that he also would like to move us in that direction, toward less costly but more effective means of national defense. He is on solid ground both in a moral and military sense. There is indeed greater cause for hope.

P₁ Tak Of

The
George
ditoring
had pile
news af
shot. The
was pret
show.

The su
most esot
President's
Ethical Pr
ical and Ba
the deserve
Abram, had
ciding to
ment." Yet i
cover the new
was not so su
mission was
be the author
that have fa
Americans o
treat termina
or their deat
helpless of in
birth.

Both of the
peting values
paralyzing in
to the infac
have been ta
the infinite v
cent newborn
ously handica
ture where i
teach babies t
think of no li
burden of car
When it co
still operate
tion that me

C

preserve lif
our doctors
they are h
wondering
also suff
fear, of
degradin

And,
turned t
tions: v
decide v
or the
be kin
doctor:
The
cided
decide
evalu
consi
med
auto

sa
m
tis
ri

Mission Impossible

Hussein, Arafat To Meet Sunday On Reagan Plan

**Parley May Determine Fate
Of Mideast Initiative;
Arafat Stance Unclear**

By KAREN ELLIOTT HOUSE
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
AMMAN, Jordan—Jordan's King Hussein and President Reagan are set to meet Sunday for talks that could finally decide the fate of President Reagan's Mideast peace initiative.

Unless Mr. Arafat gives King Hussein authority to enter negotiations on the Reagan proposal, which calls for a peace settlement between Jordan and the Israeli-occupied West Bank of the Jordan River and Gaza, the Reagan initiative is almost certainly dead.

What Mr. Arafat will say is anybody's guess. In recent weeks the chairman of the

For other major international news, please see:
—Senate committee urges Reagan to reduce new military aid for El Salvador, page 2.
—Trade panel rules that stainless steel imports are injuring domestic producers, page 5.

Palestine Liberation Organization has repeatedly postponed his meeting with King Hussein while he sought Arab consensus on how to respond to the king. Such consensus remains elusive, according to Arab officials, so Sunday's meeting, if it takes place on schedule, will be a real test of Mr. Arafat's willingness to lead.

Hussein Ready to Talk

For his part, King Hussein has made it clear he is ready in principle to join peace talks proposed by Mr. Reagan but only if the PLO chairman acquiesces. To go without Palestinian cooperation, Jordanian officials say, would place Jordan alone against not only Israel but the Arab world. And it could lead to a cutoff of financial aid from Persian Gulf states to terminate the financial aid that keeps the kingdom afloat.

"We prefer to fight if necessary on our own land with our own forces rather than struggle in a difficult quagmire in which we would be scapegoats for failure," said Jordanian Foreign Minister Marwan Qasem. "We aren't going to act for the Palestinians. They must do it for themselves."

Regardless of the outcome, these Arafat-Hussein talks are critical. "Within a number of days we will know where we stand," King Hussein told reporters recently.

Even if President Reagan's Sept. 1 initiative for an armistice between Jordan and the West Bank and Gaza, both Mr. Arafat and King Hussein have been on the spot. Because the Reagan proposal excludes an independent Palestinian state and refuses a negotiating role for the PLO, it falls short of an acceptable plan. And last month the same month at an Arab summit at Fez, Morocco. But almost all Arab leaders acknowledge that no peace plan has any chance of succeeding without a strong American role, and the Fez plan hasn't won American support.

Concern Over U.S. Election

According to Jordanian officials, King Hussein believes it is important to seize the Reagan plan before U.S. attention turns from the Middle East to domestic presidential politics. His second incentive: The rapid pace of Jewish settlement of the occupied West Bank and Gaza means that within a short time the territory will be irreversibly Israelized.

But Mr. Arafat is under enormous pressure from Syria, the Soviet Union, Libya, and various factions of his PLO to block the Reagan plan. Syrian officials insist that this is the wrong time to negotiate, contending the Arabs are more likely to settle with Israel than with other Arabs, even the friendly to America such as Egypt, caution with mind that American credibility is so low the U.S. almost certainly can't deliver even the limited "association" proposed by Mr. Reagan. After all, these Arab leaders say, the U.S. hasn't been able to get the Israelis to give up their territory; the Israelis say they don't claim so much; how can the U.S. hope to extricate Israel from the West Bank and Gaza, land the Israeli government says God gave to Is-

rael?

Little Maneuvering Room

The widespread belief among Jordanian officials, Western diplomats, and Arab observers is that Mr. Arafat has little room to maneuver because the unity of his organization is paramount to him.

Those PLO officials around Mr. Arafat want him to urge the king to press the U.S. for improvements in the Reagan plan, for some dialogue between the Palestinians and U.S. officials.

In recent months, Mr. Arafat and King Hussein have met several times to discuss a possible confederation between Jordan and Palestinians in the occupied territories. The two men aren't friends but they apparently have developed a business-like relationship. The outcome of Sunday's talks depends as much on the personal trust between the two men and on their individual capacities for leadership.

Because both men, in the end, rely essentially on themselves and not a coterie of advisers, no one here professes to know what the result will be.

British Trade Deficit Narrowed in February

By KAREN ELLIOTT HOUSE
Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
LONDON—Britain's seasonally adjusted trade deficit narrowed to the equivalent of \$202 million in February from almost \$79 million in January, the Department of Trade said.

The department said Britain's current account, which includes trade with some unilateral transfers, showed a surplus of \$61.5 million, from a deficit of \$455 million in January.

It said February exports were \$7.16 billion, up 6.8% from January, and imports fell 1% to \$7.38 billion.

C

St

for

a

Gre

In

na

lly

in

t

a

c

t

t

f

P

ir

c

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

Approved For Release 2008/01/04 : CIA-RDP88B00443R000803370001-3

where blacks rou-
er 20 percent of the

Just as Reagan has a right to wonder about the "compassion" of a candidate who so shamefully vilifies an adversary, so Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter have a right to wonder about the character of a supposed friend they once raised up out of deserved obscurity.

foreign policy that looked with favor on Fidel Castro and the Marxist guerrilla movements in Central America. Although de la Madrid has avoided the Yankee-baiting rhetoric of Lopez Portillo, he has in fact continued the substance of the traditional PRI policy by providing financial aid to the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua and to the Salvadoran guerrillas. In return, as part of an implicit bargain, the Soviets and Cubans have not yet tried seriously to destabilize Mexico.

In effect, the Mexican government has been subsidizing the guerrillas to buy protection from Castro, while at the same time relying on the United States to prevent any decisive guerrillas victory that might threaten Mexico itself.

Mexicans must realize they cannot indefinitely both have their cake and eat it, too. On the one hand, the United States may not be able to build a democratic regional alliance capable of containing the guerrillas without Mexican cooperation. On the other hand, Andropov and Castro may at any moment decide to exploit with revolutionary violence the seething discontent in Mexico. De la Madrid does not have much time left to make up his mind.

ecision

h
ga
wo
is or
tert
o re
nted
to
if

inced that
ne to keep
ne.
ew pur-
strategic
ns from
overnment
stration
co, not
serves
r la

ressed everybody in Washington with the competence, courage and honesty of its top officials. Living under an IMF-imposed austerity program that requires a 2 percent decline in the economy this year and zero growth next year, de la Madrid has succeeded remarkably in holding together his ruling Party of Revolutionary Institutions with its disparate labor, business and peasant elements.

Although strains are beginning to show in the increase in petty crime and in the growing number of Mexicans trying illegally to cross the Rio Grande, de la Madrid is lucky so far that neither the extreme left nor the far right seem well organized enough to exploit the rising dissatisfaction. But in one important respect, he has been content to repeat the errors of his predecessor.

During successive administrations, the Mexican government has tently followed a left-leaning

